

### Remarks


In the Office Action dated April 10, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-8, 17-18, 21-26, 28-32, 41-42 and 45-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent to Sliwa, Jr., et al., 5,749,364 in view of the U.S. Patent to Mackinnon, et al., 6,546,272. The Examiner rejected claims 19 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sliwa, Jr., et al. in view of Mackinnon, et al. and further in view of the U.S. Patent to Esenaliev 6,165,440. The Examiner rejected claims 9, 13-16, 33 and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sliwa, Jr., et al. in view of Mackinnon, et al. and further in view of the U.S. Patent to Baker, Jr., et al., 6,471,968. The Examiner indicated that claims 3, 10-12, 20, 27, 34-36 and 44 were objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

By this Amendment, Applicants' Attorney has re-written objected to claims 3, 10-12, 20, 27, 34-36 and 44 in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 20, 26-27, 33-34, and 44 have been cancelled.

Consequently, in view of the above and in the absence of better art, Applicants' Attorney respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance which allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**Matthew O'Donnell**

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
David R. Syrowik  
Reg. No. 27,956  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: June 25, 2007  
**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351